A BRIEF

DISCOURSE

Concerning the

Lawfulneſs of Worſhipping GOD

BY THE

COMMON-PRAYER.

Being in

ANSWER

To a Book, Entituled,

A Brief Diſcourſe concerning the Unlawfulneſs of the Common-Prayer *Worſhip.* Lately Printed in *New-England*,

Let all things be done decently, and in order, 1 Cor. 14.40.

LONDON:
Printed for **Ric. Chiſwell** at the *Roſe* and *Crown* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard. MDCXCIII.

IMPRIMATUR,

August 9. 1693. GEO. ROYSE.

THE PREFACE.

HOW Pious *or* Learned *the Author of the Book I undertake to answer may be, I am no more concern'd to know, than I am who the Author is, whom the Publisher hath thought fit to commend as such; and having so done, to conceal. But he is not (as far as I conceive) the more* Learned *or* Pious *for Writing this Book: Nor the more* Learned; *for by all the helps he professes to have had from* Dido-clavius, *&c. he is guilty of many gross and palpable Mistakes: And not the more* Pious, *because of the uncharitable Reflections and Inferences he every where makes. For would any man of a truly Christian Temper alledge these things now against the Common-Prayers, which were alter'd or expunged above thirty years before he publish'd his* Brief Discourse? *Or charge us with* violating *the Word of God, because we change the word* Sabbath *for the* Seventh *Day; or say that we sacrilegiously steal from it, because* Hallelujah, *or* Praise the Lord, *is sometimes left out in the Reading-Psalms; or that we equal the Apocrypha to, and set it up above the Canonical Scriptures, because it's read on the Highest Holy-days (as he saith, but not very truly) tho the Artieles of our Church expresly declare them to be only of humane composition. Suppose now I should treat this Author after the same manner; and whereas he professes to have* compared *our* Liturgy *with the* Missal, *&c. I should take all advantages given in his Book, to shew, that notwithstanding this, he had never read them. I am certain, I could much more easily, and as charitably do it, as he make good his abovesaid Charge. For would any one conversant in the* Missal, Breviary *and* Ritual *of the Church of* Rome, *have said (as he doth, p. 5.)* That *Beza* notes, that in the *Roman* Liturgy men are taught to cry, *Jesu Miserere mei,* no less than ten times one after another? *For what need he quote* Beza *for that which he has (as he saith) read himself; and which after all,* Beza *mistook, and he with* Beza; *or rather he mistakes* Beza *in; since the* Jesu Miserere *thus repeated, is not in the* Missal, *&c. but in private Offices of that Church. Who again, that had been conversant in our Liturgy, would have said as the Author,* Some have observ'd that of 172 Apocryphal Chapters, but 38 are omi-

ted? *For what need he to be beholden to another's* Observation, *for what he that had thus read the Liturgy must have under his own eye? So easy is it to repay him in his own Coin, if we will reflect and infer after his way.*

It's a shrewd sign this Author was hard put to it to make good his Charge against the Liturgy, and to prove his Point, That it's unlawful to be present at the Common-Prayer Worship.

And after all, it's of little Service to our Author, and those of his Communion, to make such Exceptions as he has done; for if all things were alter'd and remov'd that he objects against, they of his way would be no nearer to us than they are, as the things stand at present; as long as we are a National Church, and have a Liturgy; and whilst they continue Independent and Congregational, are against the use of any Forms, even such as are Scriptural (as the Lord's Prayer and Decalogue); nay, against reading the Scripture in their Publick Congregations.

Indeed he had dealt more sincerely, if he had acquainted his Reader, That they hold it unlawful to communicate with us, because we are a National Church; and that they don't joyn in the Common-Prayer Worship, because it's a Form, and all Forms are in his Opinion unlawful. This indeed had struck at the Root of all; but this he knew was not so easily prov'd, nor would look so popularly, as to cry out Heathenism, Judaism, *and* Popery, *which he charges our* Service Book *with. This indeed will rouze the Multitude; and it's no wonder when possess'd with this Representation of our Worship, that the deluded People broke into the Church* (Erected at Boston *for the Worship of God, according to the Church of* England) *to search for the Images they supposed we worship'd. The time was when the* Antinomians *from among themselves, treated them in the like way, and call'd them* Legal Preachers, Popish Factors, Scribes and Oppofers of Christ. *And they may remember what had like to have been the Effect of it, if they had not taken up what their Adversaries call'd a* Bloody Tenet. *And truly we had reason to fear it, if there had not been a Superior Authority to over-rule it.*

History of *Antinomians*, in the Preface.

But I shall forbear to recriminate, and shall leave the rest to the Book, where I have let nothing escape that requires an Answer; and I hope have given a sufficient Answer to it, and in the issue have prov'd, That (as far as his Exceptions go) they have no reason to forbear being present at, or joyning in the Common-Prayer-Book Worship.

A BRIEF DISCOURSE Concerning the Lawfulness of Worshipping GOD BY THE COMMON-PRAYER.

THE Question proposed by the Author, is,

Q. *What are the Reasons why you judge it unlawful to be present at, or to partake in the Common-Prayer Worship?*

The Reasons he gives are four, taken,

1. *From the Original of the Common-Prayer-Book, which,* saith he, *with the Ceremonies and Worship prescribed therein, I find to be in a great measure Popish and Heathenish.*

2. *From the Matter of the Common-Prayer-Book.*

3. *Because Publick Liturgies of Humane Composure, are an Innovation and Deviation from Primitive Purity.*

4. *In this Age of Light, it would be a great Apostacy in the least to countenance or comply with the Common-Prayer-Worship.*

These are the Reasons he advances, and by which he endeavours to justify their continuance in a Separation from the Church of *England*, and the Worship therein Administred.

And these I shall take the liberty to examine.

For the clearer discoursing upon which, I shall divide what I have to say, into so many Chapters, *viz.*

1. Of the Original of the Common Prayer, or *English* Liturgy.
2. Of the Matter of it.
3. Of the Original of Liturgies.
4. Of Worship by a Liturgy.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Of the Original of the English *Liturgy.*

OUR Author saith, That *the Common Prayer Book, with the Ceremonies and Worship prescribed therein, are in a great measure Popish and Heathenish*; and therefore it is unlawful to joyn with it.

This will be resolved into Two Questions.

Q. 1. Whether the Common Prayer be taken out of the Mass-Book, and be Heathenish, as well as Popish?

Q. 2. Whether the being taken out of the Mass-Book, makes it unlawful to be used or joyned with, tho it be good and lawful in it self?

Q. 1. Whether the Common-Prayer is taken out of the Mass-Book? As our Author takes care to represent it, one would think there is little of the *Roman* Service left out in ours. *The Common Prayer*, saith he, *is in a great measure Popish—is taken out of the Popes Mass-Book—it cannot be denied it's derived from thence*, p. 1. *There is very little in the* English, *which is not to be found in the other*, p. 2. This is matter of Fact, and so is not to be determined by Authority. He himself makes a fair proposal, which I shall accept of, viz. *Let such as have any hesitancy about this matter compare the Popish Missal*, &c. *with the* English *Liturgy, and they will be convinced*, That he had never read and compared them; or is guilty of a notorious Abuse that he puts upon his Ignorant Reader, that after he pretends to have read and compared, shall assert so gross a falshood, and say, There is very little in the *English*, that is not to be found in the other, *&c.*

1. For there is little comparatively in the *English*, which is to be found in the *Roman* Liturgy, and far more is left out, than ever was taken thence. This is indeed directly contrary to what he affirms, and yet let any one compare them, and he will be convinced of the truth of it. Take that which is called *the Canon of the Mass*, or Form of Administring the Eucharist, and there is no Agreement, not one Collect or Prayer the same. Go we to Baptism, there is not one Prayer belonging to that Office that is in ours. And as for the Litany, there is not a third part of theirs in ours, and much in ours which is not in theirs.

2. There

2. There is nothing in the Service of the Church of *Rome*, which makes it *the Popes Miſſal*, and is peculiar to that Church, that is in ours; that is, there is no Popery in our Liturgy. This he is in part forced to acknowledge. *There are*, ſaith he, *things* (*as Prayers for the Dead*, &c.) *in the* Roman *Liturgy*, *which are not tranſlated into* Engliſh. His *Et cætera*, if branched into particulars, would be very large, as he could not but know, if he had *read* and *compared* them. As for Example, Where are their Croſſings, Elevation, and Adoration of the Elements? Where their Solitary Communion, and Communion in one kind? Where their frequent Croſſings of themſelves, and of the Book? Where their material Croſſes, and the Adoration of them? Where their Prayers for the Dead? Where their Interceſſors, the Virgin *Mary* and Saints, that are to be found in the Canon of the Maſs? Where are the many Exorciſms, the Puffs they blow in the Infants face, their Conjuration of Salt, *for a wholeſome Sacrament to the driving away of Devils*, that's put into the Mouth of the Infant, *as a Propitiation unto Eternal Life?* Where the Spittle with which the Ears and Noſtrils of the Infants are touched with an *Ephphatha*, *be opened?* Where the *Oyl of Salvation*, (as it's call'd) wherewith the Prieſt anoints the Child's Breaſt and Shoulders in form of a Croſs? Where the Chriſm or Oyntment wherewith he anoints the Crown of the Head in figure of a Croſs? Where the change of Garments, their Purple and White Robe, that the Child is to *carry unſpotted before the Tribunal of our Lord?* Where the lighted Candle put into the Child's hand, that *when our Lord ſhall come to the Wedding*, *he may meet him?* Where the many Croſſings of the Head before Baptiſm, and of the Eyes, Ears, Noſtrils, Breaſt, Shoulders, Mouth, &c. to be found in their Ritual and Paſtoral? *Laſtly*, To go no further, Where are the *O Holy* Mary, *Mother of God*, &c. *pray for us?* Where are the Angels and Arch Angels, the Patriarchs and Prophets, the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts; the Martyrs, Popes and Confeſſors, the Prieſts and Levites, the Monks and Hermits, the Virgins and Widows, the Forty ſeven Saints in particular, and all Saints in general; that are called upon in their Litany, *Pray for us?* And if nothing that is truly Popiſh be to be found in our Liturgy, we have ſo far reaſon to deny that it's taken out of the Maſs-Book.

3. I add, That our Service is ſo far from being taken out of the Miſſal, that whatſoever in it is the ſame with the Office in the Church

Church of *Rome*, is mostly taken out of the Ancient Offices of the Christian Church. And because every one cannot compare it, I will produce Impartial Authority for it. Thus saith Mr. *Bell*, a Nonconformist of great Note in the last Age, *The* English *Liturgy is not a Collection out of the Mass-Book, but a refining of the Liturgy, which heretofore had been stained with the Mass,—— and is not a Translation of the Mass, but a Restitution of the Ancient Liturgies.* So the Ministers of *Old England*, in a Letter to the Ministers of *New England*, wrote *Anno* 1637. *It's no hard task to them, that our Service-Book was reformed in most things according to the purest Liturgies, which were in use long before the Mass was heard of in the World*, p. 2.

Trial of the Grounds of Separ. c. 8. p. 152.

To these I will add one more, for the Character our Author gives of him, *viz.* Bishop *Jewel* (whom he calls *that great Light in the* English *Church*, p. 9.) Who saith, *We are come as near as possibly we could to the Church of the Apostles, and of the old Catholick Bishops and Fathers.— And besides, we have aimed not only our Doctrine, but Sacraments also, and Form of our Publick Prayers after the patern of their Rites and Ordinances.*

To say the truth, its a very odd thing to represent our Liturgy as Popish, when those that composed and used the Liturgy, were burnt by the Papists for it, and when to this day they will not communicate in it, nor with the Church that useth it. Our Author saith, *There have been Jesuits and Popish Intelligencers that approved of our Service, and Pope* Pius *5th would have ratified it?* And is it therefore Popish? The Independent allows the Presbyterian Confession of Faith; And this Author saith, p. 4. *It must be acknowledged that such of the Church-of-*England*-men, as keep to the 39 Articles in matters of Doctrine, are as Orthodox as any Protestants in the world.* And is therefore the Independent a Presbyterian, or this Author a Church-of-*England*-man? I trow not. All is, that they agree in the common Principles the other receives, and yet one is no more the other, than if they had no agreement in such Principles. And so is it here, the *English* Liturgy has nothing but what is agreeable to the Doctrine of the Gospel, and allowable by the Christian Church; and therefore what the Papist will, or ought to allow; but for all that, we are no more Papists, nor that any more Popish, than the Independent is a Presbyterian, or our Author a Church-of-*England*-man. It was not then, because it was Popish, that they approved of our Service, but that it was Christian, and pure in its Order and Composure. It was not because

cause it was Popish, that the Pope would have ratified it, but because upon any terms he would have prevailed upon Queen *Elizabeth* to own his Authority, and regain'd her to their Church.

4. However I deny not, but that the Compilers of the Liturgy did peruse the Popish Offices, and take as much from thence, as was conformable to the Ancient Offices, and was fit to be used; and that the rather, that they might the more easily satisfy doubting or discontented Minds under the Alterations then made, and induce them to comply with them. And this was the meaning of King *Edward*'s Proclamation. A practice very Christian and commendable, and agreeable to the Apostolical prudence, which we read of, *Acts* 15. 16. 3. *1 Cor.* 9. 19, *&c.*

And which the Nation soon felt the happy Effects of, when by this excellent Conduct it became, generally speaking, Reformed. But yet after all, so little was taken out of the Mass-Book, *&c.* that they differ'd more than they agreed in, and more was left than taken out.

But our Author stays not here, *That the* English *Liturgy*, saith he, *is originally Heathenish as well as Popish, is manifest*, 1. *In that the Pope's Liturgy from whence ours is deriv'd, is so. The principal Parts of the Mass-Book were borrowed from Idolatrous Pagans. They came from* Numa Pompilius, *p.* 4. *Anſ.* It has been sufficiently made out by Protestants, that there is a great Affinity and Agreement between the Heathenish and Popish Rites; but our Author does an injury to the Argument, when affirming, that the *Principal Parts* of the Mass-Book were borrowed from Idolatrous Pagans, he goes no further than *Vestments*, *Holy Water*, *and Incense*, as if these were the *principal Parts* of the Mass-Book, and the chief things that that agreed in with the Idolatry of the Heathens.

But this indeed is not to our purpose; suppose there be this Conformity between the Papist and the Pagan; what is that to us, if we agree with neither? But that he attempts to prove.

But tho he cannot find *Incense* and *Holy Water*, and his *Et cætera* among us, yet he saith, *What vain Repetitions does the Common-Prayer Book abound with? In one Service the Worshippers must repeat these words*, Good Lord deliver us, *Eight times over. And*, We beseech thee to hear us, *Twenty times over. The* Gloria Patri *is to be repeated Ten times in the same Morning or Evening Service. That the Heathens were wont to Worship their Idols just after the same manner, is clear from* Matth. 7. &c. *And* Beza *notes*, *That the* Roman *Liturgy does abound with them, wherein Men are taught to cry*, Jesu, Jesu, miserere mei, *no less then Ten times one after another.*

For the better Resolution of which, I shall proceed in this order.

1. We grant, that there may be such things as vain Repetitions in Prayers, and other Divine Offices, for that is a fault our Saviour charges on the Heathens; and what we, as well as our Author, charge on the Church of *Rome*, and is also frequently charged by those that use and plead for Forms, on those that use extemporary Prayers.

2. We yet do maintain, That there are such Repetitions in Divine Worship, as are not vain; that are neither Heathenish or Popish. Such do we read of in the *Old Testament*, as *Psalm* 57. 1. 75. 1, 4, 5. 94. 1. 103. 1, 2, 22. 107. 8, 15, 21, 31. 136. *throughout*. And thus our Saviour repeated the same words thrice in his Agony in the Garden, *Matt.* 26. 44. and twice on the Cross, *Matt.* 27. 46. And consequently all Repetitions are no more condemned by our Saviour in *Matt.* 6. 7. than all long Prayers are, *Matt.* 23. 14. So that the vanity of Repetitions does not consist in using the same words eight times or twenty times in Prayer. For do we repeat in our Service, *Good Lord deliver us*, eight times: And *Glory be to the Father*, &c. ten times? And, *We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord*, twenty times? So we find, that they not only had their thrice, and their four times, but their twenty seven times in every Verse of *Psalm* 136. *His mercy endureth for ever*; which *Psalm* was most used on solemn Occasions, as we may find it, 2 *Chron.* 5. 13. 7. 3, 6. 20. 21. *Ezra* 3. 11. *Jer.* 33. 11. So that we may more truly say of the Church of God among the *Jews*, than he doth of the *Heathens*, and their Idols, that *they were wont to Worship* God *just after the same manner*, with Repetitions in their Service, as we.

3. We are to consider wherein the vanity of Repetitions consists, so as to be after the manner of the Heathens. This admits great variety, and just bounds cannot be set; so that it's not to be exactly said, Here the vain Repetitions begin. But they are such;

1. When they that use them, think that they shall be *heard for their much speaking*, as our Saviour saith, the Heathens did: Thus the Priests of *Baal* did, crying out, *O Baal hear us*, from Morning till Noon; and accordingly *Elijah* upbraids them, 1 *Kings* 18. 26, 27.

2. When it is nothing but Tautology, *viz.* a Repetition of the same words without new Matter; or of the same matter, but in different words. Such were the Verses of *Battus* the babling Poet. Such were the Hymns used often by the Heathens, in the worship of their gods. Such are the *Jesu, Jesu*, &c. without Intermission, sometimes used in the *Roman* Church.

But

But when there are diſtinct Petitions, as when we ſay, *We beſeech thee to hear us good Lord*, it's as lawful to cloſe each after that manner, as it is to ſay *Amen*, which we find to follow every particular Petition, and was diſtinctly repeated for twelve times together after that manner, *Deut.* 27. 15.

4. Vain Repetitions, are when the words are thought ſufficient, tho the Heart be not with them; but this may be common to any. So that tho there are Repetitions in our Service, as there were among the Heathen, and are in the Church of *Rome*, yet ours are not vain, nor ſuch Repetitions as theirs, by reaſon of the matter only, if accompanied with the heart.

3. He ſaith, *Some of the moſt Learned Patrons of Liturgies produce it as an Argument for them, that the Heathens made uſe of Forms in their Idolatrous Worſhip*, p. 5. And ſo he makes this the difference between the Heathens and Chriſtians, that the firſt uſed Forms, but the laſt prayed without them. As for the practice of the Chriſtians, we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of it under another Head; neithe ſhall I trouble my ſelf with the Opinion of thoſe *Learned Patrons of Liturgies*, he ſpeaks of: But I ſhall take his Argument as it lies before us, which is, That our Liturgy is Heatheniſh, becauſe we uſe Forms as they did. He might as well have ſaid, our Liturgy is Heatheniſh, becauſe we uſe words as they did; ſince it's no more Heatheniſh to uſe Forms than Words. If they had the uſe of Forms, it rather ſhews the ſenſe that Mankind generally have of this matter; and that there cannot be too great a care taken of our demeanour in Divine Worſhip, according to the Direction of the Wiſe man, *Eccl.* 5. 2. *Be not raſh with thy mouth, &c. for God is in heaven*, &c. *therefore let thy words be few*, and well-conſidered. But if the Heathens had Forms, ſo had the *Jews*, ſo had Chriſtians, as I ſhall ſhew; and ſo Forms no more make our Worſhip Heatheniſh than Jewiſh. But of this afterwards. But ſuppoſing, that our Liturgy was (as he would have it) taken out of the Maſs-Book; yet,

Q. 2. Will the being taken out of the Maſs-Book, make that Worſhip which is otherwiſe, good and lawful, to become unlawful to be uſed, or joyned with?

This he affirms, and offers to prove after this manner,

It's a known maxim, (ſaith he) Omnis honor Idoli eſt Idolatria. *He that ſhall put any reſpect upon an Idol, cannot be clear of the Sin of Idolatry; but the Maſs-Book is an Idol. And he that uſeth a Prayer, or joyns with a Prayer taken out of that Book, thereby puts an Honour upon an Idol. — How then can we joyn in Prayers taken out of the Idolatrous Maſs-Book, and offer them to the Holy God?*

In which there are there Three things contained.

1. That the Maſs-Book is an Idol.

2. That to take a Prayer out of the Maſs-Book is a reſpect to an Idol, and is Idolatry.

3. That it's unlawful to joyn in Prayers taken out of the Maſs-Book.

1. *The Maſs-Book is an Idol.* This we may juſtly queſtion, becauſe an Idol is the Repreſentation of ſome Divine or Beatified Object, and that is as ſuch propounded and ſet up for Adoration; ſuch are the Images of God and our Saviour, of Angels and Saints in the Church of *Rome*. But in this ſenſe the Maſs-Book is no Idol; there is no Prototype or Object it repreſents, nor is any ſuch Adoration paid to it, as is paid to an Image, or a Crucifix. We grant as well as he, that the Maſs-Book is *Idolatrous*, as it contains ſome things that are ſo, and is uſed in Idolatrous Worſhip: But it no more follows from thence, that it is an Idol, than that the Incenſe, Holy Water, or Veſtments, are Idols, which are uſed when they ſay Maſs. But ſuppoſing the Maſs-Book for once to be an Idol, that we may proceed to the next queſtion, *viz.*

2. Whether the taking a Prayer out of the Maſs-Book, be ſuch a reſpect to it, as makes the Prayer to be Idolatrous? To this I anſwer, That the Prayers taken out of the Maſs-Book, and inſerted in our Liturgy, are ſo far from being a reſpect, that it is a diſreſpect to it. For at the ſame time that ſome Prayers were taken out, thoſe were rejected that were left behind, for the groſs Corruptions that were in them; and by ſo doing, the Reformers as much teſtified to all the World their abhorrence of it, as the emptying of the Houſe of the Goods and Utenſils not infected by the Leproſy, and their forſaking it, was a plain declaration of its Pollution. So that if Prayers taken from thence are good, the uſing them when taken thence, is no Idolatry, and Communion in them no Sin, and no more unlawful than it was to uſe the Veſſels that were carried out of the infected Houſe.

But this is the main Queſtion, *viz.*

2. Whether that which has been uſed in Idolatrous Worſhip, may, if otherwiſe good and lawful, be uſed where the Worſhip is not idolatrous?

This he denies, and for it offers theſe Reaſons.

1. *We ought not to name an Idol, but with deteſtation; much leſs may we offer it as Worſhip to God.* Pſal. 16. 4. Exod. 23. 13. *Hoſ.* 2. 16, 17. P. 4.

2. It

2. *It was* Paul's *Judgment, that Meat once offer'd to Idols, ſhould not be made uſe of,* 1 Cor. 10. 28. *Therefore a Service-Book offer'd to Idols ought not to be uſed. For there is a parity of Reaſon.*

3. *God hath ſtrictly prohibited his people all ſymbolizing with the Heathen in civil uſages, becauſe he would not have them imitate the Heathen,* Levit. 19. 19, 27. ——*eſpecially in matters referring to the Worſhip of God. Hence they were prohibited going up by ſteps to the Altar,* Exod. 20. 24, 26. *to plant a Grove near the Altar,* Deut. 16. 31. *And to worſhip to the Eaſt,* Ezek. 8. 16.

Before I proceed to conſider theſe Arguments in particular, I ſhall ſtate the Caſe it ſelf; for reſolving of which, we may obſerve.

1. That there are things idolatrous in their own nature, or by a ſtanding poſitive Law, and ſo are always the ſame. Such is the Picture of God, and worſhipping by Images.

2. There are things that have been cuſtomarily appropriated to Idolatrous Worſhip, and the uſe of which in common eſtimation, has been accounted Idolatrous. Such was the offering Incenſe among the *Heathens*; and therefore the Primitive Chriſtians refuſed it, as an acknowledgment of their Worſhip; and the *Thurificati* were reputed Idolatrous.

3. There are other things that are uſed as well in true as Idolatrous Worſhip, and are lawful in themſelves; ſuch as Time, Place, Habit, Poſture.

The firſt is always unlawful, and makes the Worſhip Idolatrous.

The ſecond is not to be uſed where it has been thus appropriated, and thus accounted, during ſuch an opinion of them.

So that it's the laſt of theſe that the whole turns upon; for after all the clamour he makes about Idolatry, and the charge he would fain faſten upon us, he can produce nothing that is Idolatrous amongſt us, no Images, no Prayers to Saints, nor ſo much as any thing appropriated, or in common eſtimation ſo accounted; no incenſings of Books or Images, no ſprinklings of Holy Water; but it all amounts to this, that *Forms* and *Repetitions* have been us'd by Idolaters; that they had *White Garments*, and obſerv'd *Holy-days*; So *p.* 4, 5, 8. Which are things lawful in themſelves (as I ſhall ſhew) and cannot be made unlawful by being us'd in Idolatrous Worſhip. For when Idolatry is not in the nature of the thing, but in the uſe, take away the uſe, and the Idolatry ceaſeth; and conſequently it may be lawfully uſed where there is no Idolatry in the Worſhip, and no Idolatry in the uſe of it. And if it be not to be uſed, it's not becauſe it's unlawful in it ſelf to uſe it, but becauſe

cause it's forbidden by God, as was the case among the *Jews*; or because of some circumstances that make it inconvenient and dangerous. Thus it was lawful to eat that Meat, which had been offer'd to Idols, when it was afterward expos'd to sale in the Shambles, or set upon the Table at an Entertainment; because it was thereby restor'd to a common use; when yet it was not lawful to sit at Meat in an Idols Temple, for that was to have fellowship in the Idolatry, *Chap.* 8. 10, 20. It is then no more Idolatry to use a White Garment, or a Temple, or observe a Day, or to use a Prayer that has been used or observ'd in Idolatrous Worship, or by an Idolatrous Church, than it was to eat Meat that had been offer'd to Idols. Purifie the Gold, and separate the Dross from it, and the Gold is not the worse for the Dross that was before mingled with it. Scrape the Walls, and cast out the infected materials of it, so that the House be freed from the Leprosie, and it might have been as well inhabited as if it had never been infected, *Num.* 14 41. (to make use of former Comparisons, *p.* 2*d.* and 3*d.*) and take the things lawful from the things unlawful, and they become lawful again, and may be lawfully used.

1 *Cor.* 10. 25, 26.

But saith he, *The Rubbish of the Leprous house was to be cast into an unclean place: And the Leprosie breaks out still; therefore we may have no communion with it.* p. 3.

But surely it's the same thing if we leave the House that is infected, as it is to carry away the Rubbish into an unclean place; else why doth he talk of leaving the Communion for the sake of the Leprosie of Idolatry? We grant the Church we left to be idolatrous, there the Leprosie is; and therefore we left it; but we left the Idolatry with the Church, and let him prove there is any of the Leprosie of Idolatry in what we have taken out of it, and then he would say somewhat to the purpose; but that he is far from.

Let us however consider his Arguments relating to the general part. 1. We ought, saith he, not to name an Idol, but with detestation, much less offer it as worship to God.

I answer, 1*st.* The *naming* there forbidden, is the naming an Idol with respect; and indeed the addressing any Worship to it. So *Psal.* 16. 4. *Their sorrows shall be multiplied that hasten after another God; their drink-offering of blood will I not offer, nor take up their name into my lips*: That is, they might not name them by way of worship, nor offer Sacrifice to them.

2*d.* Where is there such a naming of an Idol amongst us? what respect do we give to his Idol the *Mass-Book*? what Saint do we adore

adore? *But*, ſaith he, *The Prayers are taken out of the Idolatrous* Maſs-Book. But what then, if there be nothing of their Idolatry in the Prayers that are taken thence, when ſuch are taken thence they are no more idolatrous than before they were taken into the *Maſs-Book*.

2*d*. He ſaith, *It was* Paul's *Judgment, that meat once offer'd to Idols ſhould not be made uſe of*, 1 Cor. 10. 28. *Therefore a Service-Book offer'd to Idols ought not to be us'd. For there is a parity of Reaſon.*

I conceive he is much miſtaken in the account he gives of the Apoſtle's *Judgment*, who is ſo far from maintaining *meat offer'd to Idols to be unlawful*, that he makes it a thing indifferent (as before); and what a perſon may with a ſafe conſcience eat of without ſcruple, unleſs it be with reſpect to another's conſcience that is thereby offended, as the Apoſtle determines it, *v.* 28, 29. Now if Meat offered to Idols might be eaten of, then a Service-Book that has been uſed in Idolatrous Worſhip may be lawfully us'd (when the things contain'd in it are otherwiſe lawful and good.) *For there is a parity of Reaſon*, as he argues.

3. He ſaith, *God hath prohibited his people all ſymbolizing with Heathen*, &c.

We grant that God did prohibit the *Jews* all ſymbolizing and agreement with the *Heathens* in their Idolatry. That is not the Queſtion. But

1. Whether an agreement with Idolaters in what was once uſed by them in Idolatry, becomes Idolatry, or be unlawful becauſe it has been ſo uſed?

2. Or whether what was forbidden to the *Jews* is forbidden to all people, and to Chriſtians as well as they?

Theſe we deny.

The firſt we deny as to the *Jews*, that every thing us'd in Idolatrous Service was unlawful to them; for he ſays, *The Prieſts of* Iſis *uſed to wear Linnen Surplices*, p. 9. and yet ſuch Linnen Garments were the Prieſts and *Levites* to officiate in. So Circumciſion was uſed among the *Egyptians*, &c. and yet continu'd to be uſed among the *Jews*.

Again, we deny that what was in that kind forbidden to the *Jews*, was forbidden and unlawful to all. For

1*ſt*. A great part of what they were forbidden; was with reſpect to the people that before inhabited the Land; with whom they were to make no Covenant, but were utterly to deſtroy them, their Altars and Groves, &c. Exod. 23. 32, 33. 34. 12. Deut. 7. 2, 3, 5.

2. They were a people very prone to Idolatry, and ſo were tied up by ſtrict Reſtraints and Penalties.

3. They both came from *Egypt*, where they had long convers'd with Idolatrous Service, and afterward border'd upon Nations violently addicted to Idolatry and Sorcery; and in ſuch circumſtances there were theſe Checks laid upon them; and an aſſimilation to the Cuſtoms of ſuch forbidden.

And all this was not from the nature of the thing, and becauſe all uſages of Idolaters were unlawful, but becauſe of the circumſtances of people, time, and place: And if ſo, then we muſt leave the caſe of ſymbolizing, and no longer make it a Caſe of Conſcience, but of prudence and expediency; and ſo we are left to judge what is fit to be retained, and what not; what practiſed, and what not.

And here our Reformers ſhew'd their Prudence and Moderation, by what they choſe; when the Ceremonies were few; and what were the Ceremonies of the Proteſtant Church, rather than the *Romiſh*. When they choſe ſome, that they might not give offence to the Churches of Chriſt in other parts of the World; and yet retain'd no more, that they might not burden their own Communion. When the Offices they ſelected were agreeable to the Ancienteſt Offices of the Church.

So that there was no Reformation in any place, where ſo much temper was preſerv'd, and where the purity of Religion, and the ſincerity and ſolemnity of Divine Service were more regarded: that what was good was retained; what was noxious was purg'd out, and even what was ſuperfluous was exſcinded.

But this he will not allow.

For, ſaith he, *the uſe of ſuch a Liturgy doth harden the Papiſts in their Idolatry*, p. 4. So *the Liturgy came from* Rome, *and will perhaps lead thither again.* p. 18.

But 1. How can ſuch a Liturgy *harden* them in their Idolatry, or *lead* thither, which has none of their Idolatry in it; and in which the Papiſts are expreſly charged with Idolatry? *Vid.* Rubrick at the Communion.

2. How can this harden them, or lead thither, which has been the means of baniſhing and keeping their Idolatry out of the Kingdom?

3. How can this *harden* them, or *lead* thither, when the Papiſts agree with our Author, *That it's unlawful to be preſent at, or partake in the Common-Prayer Worſhip*, and are excommunicated if they do?

4. How can this harden them, or lead thither, when there is nothing that the Papiſts more labour to poſſeſs the people with pre-

But he adds, *p.* 4. *The* Jews *themselves are scandalized by the Liturgy. It's a celebrated Saying among them, That the Christians have their* Jephilleth *from* Armillus; *that is, their Prayer-Books from* Antichrist.

At what are the *Jews* scandalized? Is it that we have a Liturgy? So have they themselves had of latter Ages at least. And so the Author saith, *p.* 13. That he had *seen Liturgies written in the* Hebrew *Tongue.*

Is it that we receive our *Prayer-Book* from *Antichrist*? Yes, saith he, and for this quotes a *Celebrated Saying* of theirs. But is this the truer for their saying so? They say, it seems, that *Christians have receiv'd their* Prayers *from* Antichrist: But I hope that there are many Christians in the World, that have Prayer-Books which they never received from the *Antichrist* he speaks of; So the *Greek Abyssins*, &c. The whole is at least a sorry Mistake, and which, for ought I see, he understands no more than we do his *Jephilleth.* The case is plainly thus; That the Rabbins say, that *Armillus* was to be a person of prodigious form, begot of a Marble Statue in *Rome*, and was to be the last Enemy of the *Jews*, and the Leader of the Christian Forces against them; that he should kill Messias *Ben Ephraim*, and at last be killed by Messias *Ben David.* That he should give *Tephillell* תפלות, and a Law to the Christians, which he and they set up in opposition to the Law of *Moses.* So that we see that his *Tephillell* is the Law as well as the Prayers of Christians; and they make *Armillus* to be toward the end of the World, the last Enemy of the *Jews*; and how could our Liturgy, or the Liturgies now used by Christians, be the Prayers received from *Armillus*, when *Armillus* is yet to come, according to the Rabinical Notion? If the Reader pleases he may have a fuller account of this *Jewish Garagantua* in *Buxtorf's Lexicon, Chald. Talmud. Rabbiam*; for I am weary of this trifling, and unintelligible Jargon.

CHAP. II.

Of the Matter *of the* Common-Prayer-*Book.*

BEfore I proceed to the particular consideration of his Objections relating to this Head; let me observe, that if we should grant what he finds fault with to be blame-worthy; yet it's not to the purpose, and the point he proposed; which is to give *Reasons why be*

judges it unlawful to be preſent at, or partake in the Common-Prayer *Worſhip.*

And that for theſe Reaſons. For

1. There may be many things that are a reaſon againſt Miniſterial Conformity, which will not be a reaſon againſt communion with the Church; ſince there are thoſe things required to the one, that are not required to the other. Such is the Surplice, the Office for burying the Dead, Marrying, *p.* 8, *&c.* which belong to the Miniſter, and not to the People: And therefore tho it ſhould be unlawful to wear a Surplice, or uſe theſe Offices, yet ſince Lay-Communion is not concern'd in them, they are no reaſon for ſeparation.

2. Many of his Objections are only directed againſt the occaſional Offices, and ſo can be no reaſon againſt conſtant communion in the Daily Office, or in thoſe Offices in which they do not occur. As ſuppoſing what he alledgeth out of the Office of Burial, Marriage, Baptiſm, *&c.* to be true and ſufficient, yet tho they may be a reaſon againſt being preſent at the Offices of Burial, Baptiſm, and Marriage, they are no reaſon againſt Communion, where thoſe Offices are not concerned.

3. Things inconvenient, if not unlawful, are no reaſon for a ſeparation, becauſe then there could be no Communion with any Church, ſince no Church is without them: And if we ſhould grant the reading a worſe Tranſlation of Scripture, and the *Apocrypha*, in the Church, to be things of that nature; yet it will be hard to ſhew them to be unlawful in themſelves, and ſo to make it neceſſary to withdraw from the Church where they are uſed.

If theſe things be conſider'd, moſt of what he has ſaid will be prevented; but that I may not ſeem to avoid any thing, I ſhall take notice of the Particulars as they lie in order. And his Arguments taken from the Matter of the Service-Book, are

(1.) *Some things appointed therein are in the judgment of ſober and judicious perſons extremely ridiculous.* As how?

Firſt, ſaith he, *How many odd and ſenſeleſs Tranſlations of the Holy Scripture have been found therein?* It's well, he ſaid *have been found*; for he is fain to draw all his Inferences of that kind, but one, from the *Service-Book*, as it ſtood before the laſt reviſal, and that is *Pſal.* 58. 9. *Or ever their pots be made hot with thorns, ſo let indignation vex them, as a thing that is raw.* At which he triumphs, *What nonſenſe is this!* Now I do not think that to be Nonſenſe which is not ſoon underſtood; for then what will he make of the *Hebrew* in this Verſe, which has ſeveral difficulties in it? But I think there is a good account to be given

given of the ſenſe of this Verſion; and that is, Ere that the Pots are made hot with the Thorns, they ſhall be ſeverely puniſhed: The being made hot with the Thorns, ſets forth the ſuddenneſs; and the phraſe, *vexing a thing that is raw*, denotes the ſeverity of it.

(2.) His next Inſtance of *things extremely ridiculous*, is, that *in the Liturgy, the Writings of the Prophets, Acts and Revelations, are called Epiſtles.* If theſe were formerly, they are not now ſo called; but of theſe when read in the place of Epiſtles, it's ſaid, *The portion of Scripture for the Epiſtle.* That is, the Sections of Scripture read in that order, are generally Epiſtles; and ſo, as it's uſual in other caſes, gives the name to all: And as it is not now, ſo never was it called the Epiſtle of the Prophets, Acts, or Revelations; but the Epiſtle taken out of *Iſaiah*; &c.

(3.) He objects againſt the Reſponſes, *Thoſe broken Reſponds*, ſaith he, *and ſhreds of Prayer (as Mr.* Cartwright *calls them) which the Prieſts and People toſs between them like Tennis-Balls, ſeem extremely ridiculous to ſtanders-by.* Without doubt this is a venture of Wit; but I ſuppoſe there are *ſtanders-by* that will call it by another Name; and inſtead of Wit, term this ſcurrility in Converſation, and prophaneneſs in Religion; Eſpecially if we conſider how many Pſalms there are in Holy Writ, that are penn'd (or ſuppoſed at leaſt to be ſo, by Learned men) after this way. And whatever his *Standers-by* may think, there are perſons of Piety ancient and modern, that have thought this way very becoming, and of excellent uſe to quicken Devotion, and excite attention. What may not be ſaid in any caſe by ſuch perſons as theſe, that call this way of Devotion (as he doth) *a taking God's Name in vain?* And what occaſion may others take after the ſame manner, to treat their long Prayers, that are often nauſeous to *ſtanders-by*, for their affected length, and tedious enlargements, and forced Repetitions.

2. He objects, *The* Common-Prayer *Book is guilty of violating the ſacred Word of God*: And here he charges it with no leſs than obliterating, contradicting, adding to it, and detracting from it; and then concludes, *Amongſt men, clipping and corrupting of Coin is Treaſon; and certainly it's a dreadful thing to add to, or take from the Word of God.* Deut. 4. 2. Rev. 22. 19.

And it's *certainly a dreadful thing*; and wo to them that are guilty.

Here I ſhould have expected a rounder Charge by one that had ſo exactly read the Liturgy, and that he would have told the World that we take whole Chapters from the Word of God, and which have no place in our Kalender, nor are read publickly in the Church,

as I do acknowledge. And surely if the omission of one Verse in a Psalm, and of Hallelujah in others, be a *taking from the Word of God*; then much more is the omission of whole Chapters; nay, of three whole Books. But he durst not press that too far; for if he had, it would have fallen hard upon such as never have the Scriptures read in their Congregations, tho that was a solemn part of Divine Worship in the Churches of God, as the Scripture informs us, *Acts* 15.21, *&c.* And if the Church of *Rome* is so deservedly blamed for reading the Scriptures in an unknown tongue, what do they not deserve that never read them at all in their Congregations? Surely if they had, according to our Saviour's advice, considered the Beam in their own eye, they would not have thus magnified the Mote in their Brother's eye. I remember a Question in a Book of the same kind with our Author's, *Whether* Protestants *do not sin in defrauding the people of some Books and Chapters of Scripture, as well as* Papists *in defrauding them of all.* And then what sort of Protestants are they, that with the Church of *Rome* defraud the people of all, so far as the Publick Service of God is concern'd?

Survey the Book of Common-prayer; 1610. 6.

But to return: Before I shall consider his few Instances, that he would make good this Bloody Charge by, I shall premise a few things.

1. That the Instances he offers are, at the worst, Mistranslations, Slips, and Errors, and not chargeable with perverseness, according to what we charge upon the Church of *Rome*. For here is no interest to be served: For what is our Church concern'd, whether it be read as the Liturgical Translation has it, *the 7th Day*; or as the Common Translation, *The Sabbath*; whether as that, *they were not obedient to his word*; or as this, *they rebelled not against his word*; whether as that, *The rod of the wicked cometh not into the lot of the righteous*; or as this, *resteth not*: Whether as in that, the Titles of some Psalms and Hallelujahs are omitted; or as in this, they are inserted. Surely here is no interest visible in this, that should incline our Translators of the Psalter to pick out these Texts above all others to make bold with.

2. Mistranslations and Errors of this kind, are no sufficient reason for not using such a Translation, and much less for separating from a Church where they are used; for then no Translation could be us'd, or no Church communicated with, because no Church is without such Translations, and no Translation without such Errors. Thus it was in the Church of the *Jews*, when the Septuagint was used in publick; Which doth often alter and add to the original *Hebrew*; and yet was not only used, but is quoted by the Divine Writers, even in many places where those Alterations and Additions are. So it alters, *Heb.* 10. 5. 11.21. *Rom.* 10.18. *Act.* 7.8. It adds, as *Luk.* 3.36,37. *Act.* 7.14. Then

Then alſo muſt not our common Tranſlation be uſed, which beſides the miſtakes allowed to be in it, does add in many places, and particularly half a Verſe, 1 *John* 2. 23. So it adds the Dates and Subſcriptions to the Epiſtles, Chapters, Verſes, and Arguments, throughout the whole, *as if Canonical.* And of this kind are all his Inſtances.

As (1.) He ſaith, *The Common-Prayer-Book violates the word of God, as ſometimes the words of Scripture are obliterated, and others put in their room. Thus in the Catechiſm they have changed thoſe words in the Fourth Commandment, The Lord bleſſed the Sabbath-day, into the Seventh day.*

A. We grant it is ſo; but it's to be remembred, that it's not ſo in the 20th of *Exodus*, but in the Liturgy; and if the Liturgy differs from *Exodus*, it's a difference without a diſtinction, ſince the Seventh day and Sabbath are all one; and if it differs from *Exodus*, it agrees with the firſt Inſtitution, *Gen.* 2. 3. where it's ſaid, *God reſted on the ſeventh day, and God bleſſed the ſeventh day, and ſanctified it.*

(2.) He ſaith, *Sometimes the Liturgy makes bold directly and in terms to contradict the Scripture; ſo* Pſalm 105. 28. *it's ſaid they were not rebellious, but the Common-Prayer-Book ſaith, they were not obedient; and ſo* Pſal. 125 3.

We grant, That there is a ſeeming contradiction in words, but not in the meaning of it; for the relative *they* being undetermined, and indifferently to be applied to *Moſes* and *Aaron*, or to the *Egyptians*, accordingly is this place to be interpreted; if underſtood of the former, it's to read in the Common Tranſlation, *they were not rebellious*; if of the latter, it's to be read in the Tranſlation of the Liturgy, *they were not obedient.* And this laſt reading is according to the preſent reading of the Septuagint, and ſome other Tranſlations that follow that. And yet that Tranſlation was generally uſed by the Primitive Chriſtians, and was worſe than any ever uſed by us. As for Pſal. 125. 3. *The rod of the wicked ſhall not come*, &c. that is, ſo as to reſt there, and ſo as to tempt them beyond what they are able.

(3.) He ſaith, *Sometimes the Common-Prayer-Book adds to the Scripture; there are three whole Verſes added to the 14th Pſalm. And the* Gloria Patri *is frequently added to Scriptures, as if it were Canonical.*

Anſ. When he ſaith, That *it is a dreadful thing to add to the word of God*, and charges our Church with it, we might expect ſome very criminal inſtances to make it good; and when he ſaith three whole Verſes are added, one would think that this was ſomewhat invented, and herein inſerted by the Church upon ſome wicked ſelfiſh deſign. But 1. tho we allow that ſuch Verſes are added, yet it's not an addition to Scripture; for tho not found in this place, yet they are in another, *viz. Rom.* 3. 13. and quoted by the Apoſtle from other

Pſalms, *&c.* 2. It's not the Common-Prayer-Book that adds, but the Tranſlations which the Common-Prayer followed, *viz.* the Septuagint and Vulgar; and tho it was a miſtake, yet it's far from being ſuch as incurs the penalty of *Deut.* 4. 2, *&c.*

As for the *Gloria Patri*, I deny that it's added to the Scriptures *as Canonical*, any more than the Contents of the Chapters, the Chapters and Verſes of the Bible, or the Dates of the Epiſtles are; nay, I deny that it's added at all; for any one that can read, will ſee that it's not inſerted in the Pſalter, but only rehearſed as the Rubrick directs. And it was for a good end that this was anciently uſed in the Orthodox Churches of old, and is continued in ours, *viz.* in oppoſition to the *Arians*, and *Anti-Trinitarians*. *Sozom. l.* 26.

(4). He ſaith, *Sometimes words are ſacrilegiouſly ſtolen out of the Bible. As the laſt Verſe is omitted*, Pſal. 72. *So are the Scriptural Titles of many Pſalms. And I know not how often thoſe words*, Praiſe ye the Lord, *are left out.*

He durſt not truſt his Reader with the things left out, for they would have appear'd of ſo little Conſequence, as would have betrayed the weakneſs of his Cauſe, as well as his own ſpite: That verſe omitted, Pſal. 72. is this, *the Prayers of David, the Son of Jeſſe, are ended.* The Titles of the *Pſalms* are for the moſt part ſuch as are no key to the matter of them, and without which the Pſalms are as intire as the Chapters without the Contents: The Clauſe, *praiſe ye the Lord*, is in the *Hebrew*, *Hallelujah*, and is only left out when it's independent, and has no immediate Relation to the preceding or following Verſe. And the reaſon of theſe Omiſſions ſeems to be, Becauſe the Pſalms being to be read in parts, according to the ancient Cuſtom in *Chryſoſtom*'s time and before, or chanted, and ſo read on without naming the Pſalm, the Titles, *&c.* would have made a break in that order. And this was done after the manner of Singing the Pſalms in the Temple-Service, in which the Titles, and the paſſage, *the Prayers of David the Son of Jeſſe, are ended*, were to be ſure no part. And ſo it is in the Singing-Pſalms, uſed by the Diſſenters as well as us: And who may as well be charged with ſuch Omiſſions as we, who there for the reaſon abovesaid, uſe neither the Verſe nor Titles. Surely theſe Perſons are hard put to it, that after ſuch a bloody charge of violating, adding to, and taking from the Word of God, can produce no better proofs and evidences for it, but only that we leave out the Titles and Hallelujah, and that only in the ordinary Service in the publick, where they themſelves read it not at all; and when upon the like way of arguing, we may charge them with

laying

laying aſide the whole Scripture, out of which they read not one Chapter for the Information of the People. He goes on.

3. *In the Liturgy the Apocrypha Books are made equal with, nay advanced above the Holy Scripture.* Strange! that a Church ſhould be guilty of this, that in their Articles exclude them out of the Canon; and ſaith, That they are not read to confirm any Doctrine, but only for informing the Manners. But let us ſee how he proves this, not by any Aſſertion of the Church, but ſome ſtretches of Arguing. As,

(1.) They are made equal. For *in the Preface to the Common Prayer, it's ſaid, Nothing ordained is to be read but the pure word of God, or that which is evidently grounded on the ſame. But is the Apocrypha ſo?*

Here for improving his Argument, he alters the words of the Preface; and for that which is in that, *agreeable to the ſame*, he reads *evidently grounded on the ſame*, and then triumphs, *Is the Apocrypha ſo?* But take it how he will, it's evident from hence, that the Apocrypha is ſo far from being made equal with Scripture, that there is a plain difference between them; for that to which a thing is agreeable, and on which it's grounded, is above that which is agreeable to it, and grounded upon it. A Plea grounded on the Law, is (ſurely) of leſs Authority than the Law on which it is grounded. The Apocrypha being read, not for eſtabliſhing any Doctrine, but for informing the Manners; there is nothing in what is appointed of that kind to be read, but what is agreeable to the word of God, and not contrary to it; and ſo may be read, as well as their Sermons be heard, which can pretend to no more.

(2.) He ſaith, *The Liturgy appoints the Apocrypha to be read as Leſſons, juſt as I find it in the Pope's Service Book, and in a greater proportion than Scripture; for (as ſome have obſerv'd) of 172 Apocryphal Chapters, but 38 are omitted. So that theſe Books are equalized with the pure word of God.*

But ſurely he doth not *find* it in our Service-Book, that the Apocrypha Leſſons are read for Canonical Scripture, and declared to be ſo, as they are in the *Pope's Service-Book*; but only as Apocrypha. He that will look for the Apocrypha Books in the Pope's Bible, as well as Service-Book, will find them mixed with the Canonical, as *Heſter* and *Eſdras*, &c. but he that will find them in our Bibles, will find them by themſelves, and *Apocrypha* in the head of them.

If, as he affirms, the Apocrypha is read in a *greater proportion* than Scripture, it doth more than equalize, and doth rather advance it above the Scripture, and ſo belongs to his next Aſſertion, which he would have done well to have reſerved it to, to make up the proof he is there wanting in.

As

As for what he affirms, that the Apocrypha is read in greater proportion than the Scripture, nothing more false. For,

1. All the Second Lessons throughout the Year, are out of the *New Testament*.

2. All Epistles and Gospels read on Sundays and Holy-days, are wholly out of Canonical Scripture.

3. All First Lessons on *Sundays* are out of the *Old Testament*, and none out of the Apocrypha.

4. On the 33 Holy-days on the Week-days, there are but 26 Apocrypha First Lessons, whereas there are 40 out of the Canonical Scripture.

5. When the Apocrypha is appointed to be read in course, it's not clear two Months for First Lessons, but the Holy Scripture is read all the other Ten Months, and more.

6. Of the 39 Books of the *Old Testament*, but 3 are entirely omitted, *viz. Chronicles* and *Canticles*; but of the 13 of the Apocrypha, 6 are not read at all.

7. Of the 929 Chapters of the *Old Testament*, 753 are read in course, and 176 only omitted (the reasons for which generally will appear to the Reader); but out of the 172 Chapters of the Apocrypha, there are (not as he saith 38) 66 omitted, and among them that of *Tobit*, that he objects against. Where methinks he that pretends to have read and compar'd, should have had more value for his own understanding, than to be beholding to others, and to say *some have observed*; for there is nothing like a man's own observation in matter of Fact.

(3.) He saith, *The Liturgy advanceth the Apocrypha above the Scripture, by intimating that they are more edifying, and can be less spared than many portions of the Holy Canon; and by ordering them to be read on the highest Holy-days, and many of them twice, some thrice in one year.*

Methinks in such a round Charge as this, that *the Liturgy advanceth the Apocrypha above Scripture*, he should have had more than an *intimation* for his evidence. He calls it before, High-Treason; and surely it's very hard to be condemned for it by a bare *Innuendo*; and yet even he fails in his *intimation*. For 1. if it were true, that the Liturgy ordered the Apocrypha to be read on the *highest Holy-days*, and many of them *twice or thrice in the Year*; it would not follow, that they accounted them *more edifying, and less to be spared* than Scripture; especially when Scripture is read on the highest Holy-days, and some portions of it twice or thrice in the year too.

2. It's not true, that it's *ordered to be read on the highest Holy-days*: For on the highest Holy-days, there is nothing but Scripture to be read; such are all the days dedicated to our Saviour, as the Nativity, Circum-

Circumciſion, Epiphany, Good-Friday, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion; and all the Lords-days.

3. He ſaith, *Many of them are read twice, ſome thrice in the year.* For the twice, it's only 25 Chapters, *viz.* 7 in *Wiſdom*, and 18 in *Eccleſiaſticus*: And as for his thrice, there is none but the 5th Chapter of *Wiſdom*, which after it had been read on *the Converſion of St.* Paul, has 17 Verſes of it read on All-Saints. But now, as to the Scripture, the whole *New Teſtament*, except the *Revelation*, is read over twice in the year in courſe, beſides Epiſtles, Goſpels, and Leſſons out of it on Holy-days. And the *Old Teſtament* is read over once, except as before excepted, in courſe. And many Portions are read again in the Service of *Sundays* and Holy-days, which amount to above 140 Leſſons; and ſome few have a third Courſe.

Would any one that obſerves this, think ſuch a Writer, a Perſon of any care, I had almoſt ſaid Conſcience; that utters as black Slanders as Pen can write, or Mouth can utter, and charges a whole Church with violating the Word of God, and adding to it, and detracting from it, and of advancing human Writings above it, and yet ſhall come off with changing a Seventh day for Sabbath, with leaving out Hallelujah, with Intimations, and Falſities, with others Obſervations, that pretends to have read and compared, and what not; and after all, charges us with this, for Leſſons appointed to be read in the Publick Congregation, when they themſelves read none at all; and have no other Tranſlation of Scripture, than what was tranſlated by us, and which they uſe in Common with us? This is hard uſage indeed; and if we ſhould retort upon them in the like way, we ſhould think, if we may judge of their value for Scripture by their Publick Service, there are none have a leſs eſteem for it than they, that read not one Chapter of it by way of Leſſon throughout the year, as has been before ſaid.

4. He ſaith, *Such things are enjoyned in the Common-Prayer-Book, as (to my Conſcience) cannot be practiſed without Sin.*

But what is this to thoſe that are not obliged to practiſe them? What is it to Laymen, that the Prieſts are required to give the Holy Communion to all new-married Perſons; or to uſe the Prayers over the Dead; or to put the Ring on in Marriage; or uſe the Surplice, *&c.?*

But what is this which cannot be practiſed without Sin?

1. *Miniſters are required to give the Holy Communion to all new-married Perſons, whereas Marriage-Feſtivals uſe to be accompanied with ſuch Divertiſements as unfit them. By this Doctrine, all that may Marry, may come to the Lord's Supper, whereas Marriage is an Ordinance which Men as Men*

(*and not as Christians only*) *have a right unto. So that by this Prescription many will eat and drink Damnation to themselves.*

Ans. (1.) If this was required, yet it's not inconsistent with that state, which is rightly call'd, *The Holy Estate of Matrimony*; and besides, those Divertisements do not precede but follow.

(2.) Surely those Persons that are married amongst us, are supposed to be Christians, and not to be married merely as Men.

(3.) If any eat and drink their own Damnation, it's their own fault; and the danger of it doth not release any of their Duty, or justify their neglect of it.

(4.) But the Common-Prayer-Book doth not compel them; it saith only, That *it's convenient at their Marriage, or at the first opportunity after it.*

2. *When any Man is buried, the Priest must say, Almighty God has taken to himself the Soul of our dear Brother, perhaps the most wicked Wretch on earth. And that his Body is committed to the ground, in sure and certain hope of a Resurrection to Eternal Life; Tho he did never truly, nor so much as visibly, to the judgment of Charity, repent of his Sins.*

A. 1. The Office of Burial, supposes that of Visitation of the Sick to go before, where the Minister is appointed to examine, *Whether he repent him truly of his Sins?* &c.

2. It supposes the Exercise of Discipline, and that such as he speaks of, have the Censures of the Church exercised on them, which if it be not exercised, we know whom we are to thank for the relaxation of it.

3. However, the Church provides not for extraordinary, but ordinary Cases; and if an extraordinary Case happens, and be notorious, no Rule then binds.

4. If it be not notorious, it's safer to err on the charitable side.

5. It's not now said, That it's *certain hope of a Resurrection to Eternal Life.*

3. *The putting on the Ring in Marriage, especially the making that Ceremony to be an essential Matter, is Superstition.*

A. 1. What Superstition can there be in this, more than in joyning of Hands, both of which are Civil Rites; and fit Declarations of pledging their Troth to each other?

2. How can that be Essential, which is one of the *alterable* things meant in the Preface?

3. It's necessary there should be some Rite used, and some actions by which the espousal should be solemnized, and why not a Ring as well as joyning hands? And why not these as well as others? Therefore *Bucer* calls it, *a very fit Ceremony.* Script. Angl. cens. c. 20.

4. *Churching Women, and their Offerings, is Jewish Superstition.*

A. (1.)

A. (1). Why Jewish? Is there any other Sacrifice than that of Thanksgiving offered, as there was, *Levit.* 12. 6.

(2.) What Superstition is there more in kneeling down at offering up Thanks to God, than in putting up a Bill. However the said Author saith, *This is agreeable to Scripture*, c. 24.

5. *The Observation of Popish Holy-days, especially such as are dedicated to Saints, I look upon as highly Superstitious.*

A. (1) He looks upon them as such, but how far soever his Opinion may pass with his own Disciples, yet others expect somewhat more.

(2.) Why doth he add Popish? Surely he that has read and compared the Popish Liturgy with ours, must needs know that we have no Holy-days for Popish Saints in our Liturgy. As to which, I shall refer our Author to Mr. *Perkins* on *Gal.* 4. 10.

6. Of the Surplice, he saith, It's *highly Superstitious. When Holy Vestments were in use among the* Jews, *they had an express Command for them. Should they have made a Mitre or Ephod, or other Ecclesiastical Garments of their own heads, they would have sinned greatly? Witness* Judg. 8. 27. *If then the Church of God had no power to appoint Sacred Vestments, no more has the Church in these days.— Moreover the Surplice is immediatly borrowed from Idolatrous Mass-mongers.— Dr.* Abbot (*who was no Fanatick*) *saith, That all Priestly Garments, whereby Ministers are distinguished from the rest of the Church, are a special part of the Character of the Beast. The Papists take the Surplice from* Jews *and* Heathens. *There were Vestments for the Worshippers of* Baal, 2 Kings 10. 12. *Bishop* Jewel *saith, The Priests of* Isis *used to wear Linnen Surplices. Moreover the greatest part of our Protestant Divines have disliked this Superstitious Garment. So Martyr*, &c.

1. His Argument is, the *Jews* had express Command for their Garments, *&c.*

A. (1.) Had the *Jews* no Power to appoint or observe any thing relating to Worship without express Command? How then come the Feasts of *Purim* and *Dedication*, the Places and Houses of Prayer? Nay, whence came the alteration of the posture at the Passover (which our Saviour complied with) contrary to the first Institution? And surely Vestments are much of the same nature with Times and Places, *&c.*

(2.) Supposing the *Jews* might not, what is that to us? Yes, saith he, *no more can we.* Why so? The Apostle shews we have a liberty they had not, and we may as well do what they could not, as forbear what they might not. They had not a liberty as we, because under a Schoolmaster, and of a Temper that needed it, and whose Service was Typical. And yet notwithstanding this, they had a liberty which they might use, and much more then have we.

(2.) The Surplice, he saith, *is immediately borrowed from Idolatrous Mass-mongers.*

A. 1. What is that, if there be no Idolatry borrowed with it? Do we use it to sanctify Holy-water, Bells, *&c?*

2. As for his Quotation from Dr. *Abbot*, it's a gross mistake, or somewhat worse; all he saith is, That *the Buyers and Sellers*, Rev. 13. 16. *are the Bishops, Priests, and Monks, that expose to sale Masses and Indulgences, &c. that bind themselves by Oath to the Bishop of* Rome, *and in testimony of it, are divided from the rest of the Church by Rites, Vows, Unctions, Treasures, Garments.* Where he speaks of Garments in general, and no more of Surplices than Gowns; and of Garments they ordinarily wear, such as belong to Monastick Orders, *&c.* But if he had spoke of all Garments that distinguish the Clergy from the Laity, Dr. *Abbot* had been in that a Fanatick, and not Dr. *Abbot*, who himself wore such Garments, and surely did not think by that, he had a *special Character of the Beast* upon him.

What he quotes from Bishop *Jewel*, is not in that place (if any where) he refers to; neither in the *English* or *Latin* Volume.

(3.) *The Papists take the Surplice from Jews and Heathens*; and for this latter, quotes the Priests of *Baal.*

A. But the Text doth not say, they were any more White, than Blew or Black; and he might as well have prov'd our Gowns we ordinarily wear, or others prove their Cloaks to be such, as well as he prove our Surplices heathenish from that Text.

(4.) He saith, *The greatest part of our Protestant Divines have disliked it.*

A. 1. What saith he to the *Lutherans*, who all use the like? Are not they Protestants?

2. Do any he names dislike it so, as to think it unlawful!

3. Do they dislike it so, as to make a Schism in the Church, or for it Separate from a Church?

I am certain these he produces, do declare just contrary. Thus *Pet. Mart. Epist. Amico & Hoopero*, &c. *Beza Epist. Grindallo. Zanchy Confes.* c. 25. §. 30. *Hemingius in* 4 *Leg. Decal.* §. 29. &c. *Enchir. tit. Adiaph.* c. 16. *Polanus in Ezek.* 44. And *Zanchy* chuses the Linnen before the Woollen Garment for Divine Offices, as a Sign of Innocence and Holiness, *de Redempt. c.* 16. I could much enlarge the Catalogue of such Testimonies, if it were necessary.

So little did these Learned Men think Mr. *Nichol*'s Argument of any force, which our Author proposes, *viz.* 'That all Vestments appropriated to the Worship of God, and appointed for the Signification of Spiritual Duties, by the will of Man, are unlawful. But the 'Surplice is so. And is, he saith, *Not easy to be answer'd*: but if it be

to be anſwered, no matter whether it's not eaſy. From hence ariſe two Queſtions.

Q. 1. Whether it's unlawful to uſe any thing appropriated to the Worſhip of God by the Will of Man?

Q. 2. Whether it's unlawful to uſe any thing in the Worſhip of God that is appointed for the ſignification of Spiritual Duties by the Will of man?

By the firſt it's unlawful for men to appropriate places, or times, or poſtures to the Worſhip of God. And ſo it's neceſſary to avoid this Superſtition, to make all the Meeting-places to be Houſes of Merchandize, and to be equally divided between Religious and Common Uſes. By the 2*d* any thing that has ſuch a Signification applied to it, is made unlawful, by vertue of ſuch Signification, and which without ſuch Signification would have been lawful. So a Surplice would have been a lawful Garment, if not appropriated, and without Signification; and might have been in its ſelf worn as well as a Cloak, ſince Cuſtom and Uſe only makes the difference; but appropriate it, and clap a ſignification upon it, it's unlawful: And ſo a Cloak may be turn'd out of Service by the ſame way. So it's in poſture, kneeling and ſtanding are indifferent; but once appropriate kneeling to Prayer, and make it ſignificative, and to be a poſture of reverence, and it becomes unlawful. And ſo without end. So much for Mr. *Nichol*'s Argument, and its difficulty.

7. Come we now to the Croſs, *the greateſt Devil amongſt all the Idols of* Rome; as he tells us Mr. *Parker ſheweth.*

He ſaith 1. The firſt uſers of it were the Hereticks, *Valentinus* and *Montanus.*

A. That ſeems hard, when thoſe that wrote againſt them uſed it, as *Origen*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Epiphanius*, did againſt the former; and ſeveral others againſt the latter. We find it as ancient as *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, &c.

2. He ſaith, Mr. *Parker proveth it a ſin againſt all the Commandments, and a breach of the Letter of the ſecond: for men to appoint a Religious Ceremony, is a direct violation of the* 2*d Commandment, which forbids all human Inventions in Divine Worſhip, as any part thereof.*

A. 1. There is a way of proving too much, and that any one that reads Mr. *Parker* will ſoon perceive he doth: And of this I take this Inſtance of the 2d Commandment to be one of the letter, of which the Author ſaith, the Croſs is a breach. Now the Letter of the Command reſpects two things; 1. Not to make any Graven Image for Religious Worſhip. 2. Not to bow down to any ſuch Object.

Now

Now the Croſs uſed in Baptiſm is an *Aerial Croſs*, as he calls it; and where is the Object or the Worſhip? But our Author goes on to prove it after this manner; *for men to appoint*, &c. Here we grant the Propoſition to be true, becauſe God only is to appoint his own Worſhip; and ſo it's not in the power of man to appoint any part of it: But now if Religious Ceremonies may be, and yet not be part of Divine Worſhip, then they are no ſuch human Inventions as are forbidden; and no direct or indirect violation of the 2d Commandment. Therefore it remains upon him to prove the *Croſs a part of Divine Worſhip*: For we ſay it's only an adjunct, and is no more a part of Worſhip, than the ſtriking the Blood upon the Door-poſts was (to make uſe of *Zepperus* his Similitude) or ſitting or kneeling at the Sacrament.

3. He ſaith. *The Arguments which are brought againſt the uſe of Oyl, Cream, Salt, Spittle in Baptiſm (practiſed by the* Papiſts) *hold as well againſt the Croſs.*

Anſ. This I deny; for the Scripture ſpeaks honourably of the Croſs of Chriſt, which this refers to, but not at all of the reſt. Again, the Croſs was traduced and reproached by the *Heathens*, which gave occaſion to the uſe of it, and ſo were not the reſt. So that this was uſed with reaſon; thoſe without it.

His inſtance of the *Gallows* looks ſo prophanely, that I ſhall rather paſs it by, than correct it.

4. He ſaith, *The* Papiſts *adore the Croſs, and it's an Idol*, &c.

Anſ. But do they adore the *Aerial Croſs*? But what is their Adoration (if it were) to us, that do not adore it?

5. *This hath been teſtified againſt by* Zegedinus, Lepperus (it ſhould be *Zepperus*) *Goularius*. &c.

Anſ. The *Lutheran* Churches uſe it. See *Hemingius*, &c. *Bucer* accounts it *neither indecent, nor unprofitable*, but a Ceremony *of much ſimplicity, and of preſent admonition of the Croſs of Chriſt*; Scripti Angl. cenſur. *c.* 12. And generally they account it lawful, and not a ſufficient reaſon for ſeparation; but to be uſed, ſo it be without Superſtition. So *Goularius* in *Cypr. lib. ad Demetr. c.* 9.

8. His laſt Inſtance of Superſtition is, *kneeling at the Sacrament.* Let us conſider what he has to ſay againſt it.

1. He ſaith, *Men pretend in it reverence to Chriſt; but Chriſt himſelf was perſonally preſent, when his Diſciples partook of the Lord's Supper; yet they did not kneel, but uſed the Table-geſture then cuſtomary among the* Jews.

Anſ. How is he certain the Diſciples did not kneel, but uſed the cuſtomary Poſture in receiving? For the *Jews* in the Paſſover changed Poſtures, and did not throughout keep to that of diſcumbency. See *D. Lightfoot.* 2. The

2. The Queſtion is not what they did, but what may lawfully be done; and then the Queſtion is, whether kneeling be unlawful?

3. They themſelves no more obſerve our Saviour's Poſture, than the *Jews* did that required at the firſt inſtitution. Our Author words it cautiouſly, when he ſaith the Diſciples uſed the Table-geſture *then cuſtomary*; for he well knew it was not ſitting, but leaning, or lying along, and that they uſed this by way of ſignification.

4. If the *Table* be the Rule to guide us, then to put on our Hats is ſuitable, as he knows who reaſons.

2. He ſaith, *Good and wiſe men have choſen great ſufferings, rather than comply with this Invention.*

Anſ. And there were good and wiſe men that compiled the Liturgy, and uſed and enjoined this poſture; which is an argument he ſeeks to overthrow, *p.*16. And as Good and wiſe men have allowed and approved it; and thought it by no means allowable to ſeparate and break Communion for it. Such as *P. Martyr*, *Zanchy*, *Beza*, *Zepperus*, &c. *Bains*, *Noyes*, *Ames*, *Cartwright*, &c.

3. *In primitive times Chriſtians did not kneel in the participation of the Euchariſt.*

Anſ. 1. It's certain they did not ſit, for they had no Notion at all of a Table-geſture, as appears by the uſe of the Word Altar, and that they counted that a poſture of irreverence.

2. If they ſtood (as he ſaith) on the Lord's days, their ſtanding was a poſture of adoration, to be ſure, when they received: So St. *Cyril* expreſly, *Catech.* 5.

3. It's probable that on other days, when not obliged to ſtand, that they kneeled; and ſince they received every day, on ſix Days they kneel'd. So *Juſt. Mart. reſponſ. ad quæſt.* 115. and that more eſpecially, becauſe they had a Prayer at receiving, as we have.

4. He ſaith, *It was enjoined by Pope* Honorius, *being fitted to the Idolatry of* Tranſubſtantiation, *&c.*

Anſ. 1. This is a miſtake; for *Honorius* did firſt indeed decree Adoration to the Hoſt, but not kneeling at it. For that is a poſture no where enjoyn'd in the Church of *Rome*; and ſome of them ſay, it ought to be received ſtanding; but which way, whether ſitting, ſtanding, or lying, or kneeling, is not material ſay others, as the *Pope* himſelf ordinarily receives ſitting, unleſs he celebrates; and then, as all Prieſts then do, he receives ſtanding. And all adore not at the receiving, but at the elevation of the Hoſt. Eſpencæus *de rat. Eucl. l.* 2. *c.*

5. He ſaith, *That Religious Worſhip, which is before a Creature, and with reſpect to it, having no allowance from God, is againſt the Commandment: but ſo is kneeling before the Bread and Wine.* *Anſ.*

Anſ. 1. I queſtion whether God ever allow'd any Religious Worſhip before a Creature, and with reſpect to a Creature; for that is Idolatry, and no allowance from God can be ſuppoſed to juſtifie or require Idolatry.

2. I deny that there is any Religious Worſhip with reſpect to the Bread and Wine; *For* that, ſaith our Rubrick, *were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Chriſtians.* But it's only, as it's there ſaid, *for a ſignification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the Benefits of Chriſt therein given to all worthy receivers.*

6. He draws a Concluſion from the whole, *The* Engliſh *Liturgy is very corrupt; now to offer to the Lord a corrupt thing, is evil,* Mal. 1. 13.

Anſ. A corrupt thing there, is what is plainly prohibited: Now let him prove the things before diſputed to be ſuch: As for example, that kneeling is forbidden. As for that place in *Malachi*, I leave to his peruſal the *Letter of the Miniſters of* Old-England *to thoſe in* New-England, *p.* 14. where that is explained.

CHAP. III.

Publick Liturgies of humane Compoſure are an innovation, and deviation from primitive Antiquity: And again, *Set Forms of Prayer deviſed by men are an Innovation.*

FOR this he offers ſeveral Arguments.

1. Saith he, *Had a Liturgy been needful for the edification of the Church, undoubtedly Chriſt, or the Apoſtles by his direction, would have compoſed one, which none of them ever did. And therefore theſe men who take upon them to compoſe and impoſe a Liturgy on the Churches, aſſume to themſelves more than Apoſtolical Power.*

Anſ. I deny his conſequence: For tho our Saviour and his Apoſtles did, declared and left all things eſſential to a Church, yet there were many things *needful to the edification of the Church* in future Ages that were not expreſly provided for. Our Saviour told the Apoſtles, that *it ſhould be given to them in that hour what they ſhould ſpeak*; and they ſpoke all Languages by preſent infuſion; and ſo were not obliged to think before, or ſtudy or learn a Language; and this was with relation to the preſent condition of the Church in thoſe times. And there are no directions for after Ages to learn Languages, *&c.* So there *was a miraculous gift of Prayer in the Apoſtolical times* (as St. *Chryſoſtm* obſerves, *Hom.* 14. in *Rom.* 8.) and no expreſs directions given about it

it, when that Gift should cease (as he saith it did) and when by the cessation of it, Forms would be necessary. Thus saith *Capellus* (*Thes. Salmar.* Part. 3.) *As soon as miraculous Gifts ceased, and Heretick's began to trouble the Church, there was a necessity for Liturgies.* And therefore Mr. *Ball* saith, *The Christian Churches* for the space of this 1400 years at least, if not from the Apostles times, have had their stinted Liturgies. *Triall*, p. 96, &c. So Letter of Min. of *Old England*, l. 66, &c.

But this our Author denies, and calls it an Innovation.

And saith, 2. *The Liturgies father'd on the Apostles, and the ancient Writers* (called Fathers) *Learned men have evinced to be spurious.*

Ans. It's granted, that those father'd on the Apostles were so; but tho not the Apostles, yet many of the Prayers in them were ancient, and the main of that call'd St. *James's*, was used in the Church at *Jerusalem*, as Dr. *Cumber's* [*Original and Use of Liturgies*, p. 97.] in Answer to *Clarkson*, has shew'd from *Cyril.*

2. It's certain there was a Liturgy composed by St. *Chrysostom* and *Basil*, and a great part of what is so call'd was certainly theirs; as the abovesaid Author has shew'd, *p.* 167, 172, 209. and of this mind were * *Mornay* and † *Rivet.*

* *Of the Mass l.* 1 c. 6.
† *Censur.* 10.

3. The least that can be observed from these Books, is, that when those Books were writ, then Liturgies were in use; so *Daille*; *We deny not but many of these Liturgies are ancient, and written about the beginning of the Ninth Century, tho they were corrupted by Addition and Alterations at several times after their first original.*

De cultu. Lat. l. 3 *c.* 13.

3. He would prove from an obscure Passage in *Justin Martyr* and *Tertullian*, that there was *no Book of Prayer used by Christians* 200 years after Christ.

Ans. The Passage in *Justin Martyr* is, ἐυχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ ἀναπέμπει. Which our Author is forced to corrupt, and add to, before he can work it to his purpose; for thus he translates it, *according as strength and utterance was afforded to him from Heaven:* Whereas word for word it is, *in like manner he* [the President] *offereth up Prayers to him* [God] *as he has power*, that is, as fervently as he could: and so the same Phrase a little before. Of this see D. *Cumber*, *p.* 33, &c. And as little does the Passage in *Tertullian* make for his purpose, which is, That the Christians prayed, *Sine Monitore quia de pectore*; which surely relates not to the praying extempory; for what testimony was that of their Loyalty, more than if they prayed by a Form; but his plain meaning is, they needed no Prompter (as the *Heathens*) but prayed heartily for the Emperors, &c. as their Offices shew'd.

4. He saith, "That there was no Liturgy in some Churches, or in "general use in the Church, for above 400 years, is manifest from *So-* "*crates*; who saith, *There were scarcely two Christians found who used* "*the same words in Prayer*, l. 5. c. 21.

Ans. 1. Here he perverts again: For (1.) *Socrates* doth not say two Christians, but two Churches. (2.) He doth not say, they used the same *words*, but the same *manner*.

2. The Words of *Socrates* do not refer what he would have; for he saith, *In some among all Sects you shall scarcely find two Churches agreeing in the manner of Prayer*: Which refers not to the Words, but the Ways, as before described, *viz.* lighting up Candles, *&c.*

2. Supposing it was to be understood of the Words, what's that to Extempore Prayer? for they may not have the same words, when yet they may have Forms. The Historian's meaning is, That the Churches had different Forms of Prayer, as well as different Rites: So *Mornay* speaking of the Liturgies of the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches;

Mas. l. 1. c. 6. *Tho in substance the Service of these Churches do agree, yet we must not think there was one and the same Prescript Form observed, and kept in them all.*

5. He saith, *Some plead, that in the* Jewish *Church of old there were Forms of Prayer, besides those of Divine Inspiration*; (but that was not;) and are all *late compositures*.

Ans. 1. If there were Forms of old in the *Jewish* Church, of *Divine Inspiration*, and those Forms to be used (as the Scripture shews), then it shews that Forms may lawfully be used.

2. That the *Jews* had set-forms of human composure, of ancient times, Learned men agree: So *Mornay* shews; and that the *First Christians framed themselves after this manner of Service.*

So Mornay *Mas.* l. 1. p. 19.

3. Nay, Learned men observe, that Forms were used in our Saviour's time; and yet he is so far from condemning them, that he attended their Service, and composed a Form like to theirs. So Dr. *Lightfoot*.

Vol. 1. 157, 158, 161.

So that we see he has failed throughout in his attempt of proving Liturgies and set-forms an Innovation. But I can tell *what is an Innovation*; and that is, To hold Liturgies unlawful.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

It's an Apoſtacy in this Age of Light, to countenance or comply with the Common-Prayer-*Book Worſhip.*

UPON this his chief Topick is:

That Good and Learned men have born witneſs againſt the Corruptions of the Engliſh *Liturgy, and choſe to ſuffer rather than comply with it.*

Anſ. 1. There have been as Good and Learned men that have ſhew'd thoſe not to be corruptions.

2. There have been ſeveral of his Learned and Good men, as he ſaith *choſe rather to ſuffer, than ſin, by complying with the Liturgy*, that have ſhew'd thoſe Corrupions not to be a ſufficient reaſon for Separation: So Mr. *Bradſhaw*, Mr. *Nicols*, &c.

3. They were ſo far from refuſing Communion for them, that the Old *Nonconformiſts ordinarily and conſtantly uſed the Common-Prayer-Book in their publick Miniſtrations*; as Mr. *Ball*, one of them, declares, *Tryal*, p. 121, 155.

4. All of them teſtified againſt the *Browniſts*, and a ſeparation from the Church. *It was* (ſaith Mr. *Baxter*) *the Pariſh-Churches that had the Liturgy, which Mr.* Jacob *the Father of the Congregational Party wrote for communion with. The ſame I may ſay of Mr.* Bradſhaw, Dr. Ames, *and other Nonconformiſts, whom the Congregational Brethren think more favourable to their way.*

In the cloſe, our Author offers ſome farther objections from *the falſe and corrupt Doctrine* he pretends to find in the Liturgy.

(1.) As, that *it's certain by God's word, that Children baptized dying before they commit actual ſin, are undoubtedly ſaved*: *This*, ſaith he, *ſavours of* Pelagianiſm.

Anſ. I don't underſtand the falſeneſs, or Pelagianiſm of it. It's certain by God's Word, that *of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*, and ſo they muſt be capable of it. If capable of it, it muſt be upon Goſpel terms; but what terms they are capable of but Baptiſm, I underſtand not.

(2.) That *there are two Sacraments-neceſſary to Salvation; which implies a double Error, viz. that the Sacraments are neceſſary to Salvation; and that there are more Sacraments of the New-Teſtament than two.*

Anſ. I don't ſee wherein is the firſt Error, if he had truly repreſented it; for it's ſaid in the Catechiſm, two Sacraments *generally* neceſſary; that is, that they are a Duty belonging to all perſons that

are capable of it; where there are persons to baptize, and a Congregation to communicate with; and therefore is not said absolutely, but *generally* necessary.

As for the latter, a Sacrament is not a Scripture-word, but a Term of Art, and so hath been variously used and applied; and therefore to set out what it means, the Church has defined what a Sacrament is, and then shew'd there are but two: And so this Phrase is used to distinguish it from any other so called; and that then none but these two are generally necessary to all Christians.

(3.) *The Book saith, Some Sins are deadly, as if the Popish distinction of sins into Mortal and Venial, were a sound distinction.*

Ans. How can that be, when Fornication, which is called deadly in the Liturgy, in the Church of *Rome* is ordinarily accounted a Venial Sin; and when the distinction between Mortal and Venial (as used in the Church of *Rome*) is so contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of *England?* It's plain that our Church means thereby no other than *heinous.*

(4.) It's said, *Christ has redeemed all mankind.*

Ans. The Scripture saith, *God will have all men to be saved*; and that *Christ died for all*, &c.

2. *A stinted Liturgy*, he saith, *is opposite to the Spirit of Prayer*, Eph. 6. 18.

Ans. 1. If so, then the Spirit will not communicate it self in a Liturgy, or stinted Form of Prayer, contrary to the sense of all sober Divines. So Dr. *Owen*: *Supposing*, saith he, *those who make use of, and plead for Forms of Prayer, especially in publick, do in a due manner prepare themselves for it by holy meditation*, &c. *I do not judge that there is any such evil in them, as that God will not communicate his Spirit to any in the use of them.*

2. If so, then *almost all Churches in the world for these* 1300 *years, at least, to this day* (as Mr. *Baxter* allows) have been without the Spirit of Prayer.

3. If so, then we cannot lawfully communicate in, or with a stinted Liturgy, which has yet *been approved by all Reformed Churches*, as Mr. *Ball* saith; and Mr. *Norton* saith it's *lawful to embrace Communion with Churches, where such Forms in Publick Worship are in use.*

4. As for *Eph.* 6. 18. that we are to *pray with all Prayer*; why is that not possible by a Liturgy, when there are in it Supplications, Prayers, and giving of thanks?

3. He lets pass the Argument, from the mischief of a prescript Liturgy, and so will I pass what follows from the trivial, unintelligible, and dirty Reflections of it. For he knows we can match his

Fidler,

Fidler with Stories of ſome of thoſe that have been Eminent the other way, and could argue upon the ſinfulneſs of unpremeditated and conceived Prayer.

4. He ſaith, Mr. *Cotton* ſpeaketh weightily, in ſaying, *It's unlawful to bring ordinarily any other Book into the Publick Worſhip of God, beſides the Book of God.*

A. I know no difference between Reading and Reciting in this caſe; and I have heard Mr. *Cotton* uſed a Form of Prayer in the Pulpit. If he did not, yet all the Noncormiſts in former times did, as far as ever I could learn. *See* Cler *Collect. o Lives,* p 38.

To cloſe all; he undertakes to Anſwer an Objection, That *Good men were the firſt Collectors and Publiſhers of the Liturgy, and died Martyrs.*

This he endeavours to anſwer; and yet when it's to ſerve his own Cauſe, it's a conſiderable Argument. Thus ſaith he before, *The Corruptions of the Liturgy have been born witneſs againſt by good Men; and his Father, a Holy Man, ſuffered much for his Nonconformity*, and what not. Now ſurely, if this ſort of arguing is good for them, it's good for us.

But he Replies further,

1. *All Perſons employed in it, were not good Men, as* Day, *Biſhop of* Chicheſter. *He was a diſſembling Hypocrite, pretending to be a Proteſtant, but afterwards ſhew'd himſelf to be a Papiſt.*

A. Here he betrays groſs ignorance, or ſomewhat worſe. For tho *Day* was one of the 18 Biſhops imployed for compiling the Service-Book at firſt, *Anno* 1548. yet at that time he was for Tranſubſtantiation, and Solitary Maſſes, and againſt having the Service in the Vulgar Tongue. Burnet's *Reformat Part* 2. *l* 62. *and Num.* 25.

And when the next Review was, which was 1550. when *Cranmer* wrote to *Bucer* about it, it does not appear that *Day* was concerned; nay, rather that he was againſt it, for he refuſed to ſet his hand to the Book, before it was enacted by a Law; and was afterward turn'd out of his Biſhoprick, and depriv'd. But to ſay all in a word, What was this *diſſembling* Hypocrite to thoſe who *were truly Pious Men, and acted faithfully according to the Light they had?* as our Author acknowledgeth. *Ibid.p.*16: *p.* 203.

2. He ſaith, Good men chang'd their minds, ſo did *Ridley* and *Cranmer.*

A. Both groſs miſtakes. For Archbiſhop *Cranmer* took upon him to defend the Common-Prayer, Miniſtration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, when in Priſon. Fox's *Act and Monu ments, Fo*

A...

's Acts Monu- ts, Vol. 1940.

And Bishop *Ridley*, a little before his Martyrdom, in a Letter to his Friend, saith, *This Church had of late the whole Divine Service, all Common and Publick Prayers, framed to the true vain of Holy Scripture.*

And again, after his Condemnation, writing an Answer to *Grindal*, concerning *Knox*'s peremptory Exceptions against the Service-Book; *I grant*, saith he, *a Man (as he is) of Wit and Learning, may find apparent reasons; yet I suppose he cannot soundly by the Word of God so disprove any thing in it.*

t Dr. ylor's tyr. p. 1.

3. He saith, *Others were much troubled at the Service-Book*; as Bishop *Hooper*, and Mr. *Rogers* at home; and *Calvin*, *Bucer*, *Martyr*, *Bullenger*, &c. abroad. So *Alasco* and *Knox*, the first Reformers in *Scotland*.

A. As for *Hooper*'s dissatisfaction, it was not at the Liturgy, but the Episcopal Vestments; in which also he at last complied.

And as for *Bucer*'s mind, and *Pet. Martyrs*, the *English* Reader will find it in the History of the Reformation, *p.* 154, 155. And *Calvin* to the *English* Exiles at *Frankford*, declares against a rigorous Opposition, and was pleased that he retained Moderation in this Case.

As for *Alasco* and *Knox*, whatever they objected against the Liturgy, yet both had their Publick Offices, and Forms of Prayer.

4. He saith, *In Queen* Elizabeth's *time, the Bishops made the Common-Prayer-Book in several things worse, and more intollerable than it was in the days of King* Edward *6.*

A. 1. And I hope he will confess in many things better.

2. Why those Prayers, *&c.* were left out, he may see in the History of the Reformation, *p.* 77, 170, 392.

The reason of which has been before justified.

3. There could be no great alteration to the worse, if that was all that he mentions; and however is nothing to us, when the Rubrick of the Communion is restored.

And now, that he may end as he begun, as he would have our Service-Book come from Popery; so he will have it, *That time will discover that some, who pretend Zeal for the Common-Prayer-Book, are carrying on a design for* Rome.

And time has discovered, that some of those who pretended Zeal against the Common-Prayer, carried on a design for *Rome*, and helped them forward in it, or stood as it were Neuters; and that the Liturgy has not so much a tendency that way, as Separation.

The World saw it in the late Reign, and found that the Church that uses the Liturgy, was a Bulwark against Popery; and when those that were against the Liturgy, either basely complied, fawn'd upon it, or cowardly were silent.

The

The Second Queſtion.

Q. 2. *What reaſon have you to ſcruple the lawfulneſs of laying the Hand on the Book, and Kiſſing the Book in Swearing?*

To this he Anſwers,

1. *We do not find in the Scripture the Lords Servants were wont to ſwear after this manner; we read of lifting up the hand, &c. which is a natural ſign of Worſhip.*

A. 1. We find in Scripture, that they were wont to put the hand under the Thigh in ſwearing: And thus the ſame *Abraham* that lift up his hand, required his Servant to ſwear, by putting his hand under his Thigh, *Gen.*24.2. and ſo *Jacob* made his Son *Joſeph* to uſe the ſame Ceremony when he ſwore, *Gen.*47.29. Now, what natural Sign of Worſhip was in this Rite?

2. Since we find different Rites us'd, it's a ſign that practice of the Lords Servants is to be no Rule to us in this matter; but that we are to govern our ſelves by the Cuſtom of the place where, and the People among whom we live, if there be nothing in it ſelf unlawful.

3. He ſaith, and ſeems to allow it, That the *Romans* of old, and *Italians*, and *Spaniards*, uſe to lift up the Finger when they ſwear ſolemnly. Now I conceive lifting up the Finger is no natural Sign of Worſhip. And if it had any ſignification, I know no reaſon why the *Germans* may not lift up three Fingers; to intimate, they invoke the Sacred Trinity, which he ſaith, he *cannot juſtify*. Nor why we may not lay the Hand upon, and Kiſs the Book in token of belief of it, and of our acting according to it, and of our being judged according to it.

For the Word of God doth not preſcribe in ſuch caſes.

2. He anſwers, *Laying the Hand on the Book is a ſymbolizing with Popiſh Idolaters, and Superſtitious* Jews.

A. 1. It's not a ſymbolizing with Papiſts as ſuch; ſince there are Papiſts that uſe other Ceremonies in ſwearing, as he ſaith, The *Italians*, *Spaniards*, and *Germans* do. And therefore, if this be a reaſon, as we muſt not lift up the Fingers, becauſe they do ſo; ſo we muſt not lift up the Hand, becauſe that is not to be done, but we muſt lift up the Fingers too.

2. If it was cuſtomary among the *Jews* to produce the Law in giving an Oath, I ſee no reaſon to condemn it; and ſo know no hurt to obſerve it. They uſed alſo to adjure Perſons, and our Saviour readily anſwers to it, when thus call'd upon.

3. He replies, *Kissing in a Religious way, is a gesture of Adoration.* And he closes it, *This is clearly to worship a Book; and so to give unto a Creature that Honour which is due to God alone.* And before he saith, *So help you, the Contents of this Book; is not much better than when the Papists say, So help me God, and these Holy Evangelists, which is gross Idolatry.*

A. 1. That Kissing may be a token of Adoration, when the thing kiss'd is an Object of Adoration, is acknowledged. But it's not a token of Adoration, when the thing kissed is not an Object of Adoration. Thus kissing the Calves, and an Image, is an act of Adoration, because the Object is an object of Adoration; but kissing the Book is not, because a Book is no object of Adoration.

If it be asked, Why then is the Book kissed? I say, it's in token of Reverence, as it's the Book of God; and which, if I so kiss every time I read it, it's surely far from being Idolatry. And that it is so, appears from what follows, *So help me God, and the Contents of this Book*; which is in different ways, God by his Grace, and the Contents of this Book by their Instruction; the one as the efficient, the other the instrumental cause. And thus without doubt is meant in the old Form, *So help me God, and these Holy Evangelists*, that is, the Gospel wrote by them; as the name of *Moses* is given in Scripture to his Writings. So that in this sense it's neither Idolatry in them, nor any thing like it in us. And we may as lawfully kiss the Book, as lift up the Hand, since neither of them are prohibited by God's Law; and so being indifferent in themselves, we may act as the case requires.

ERRATA.

PAge 5. l. 22. before *But* put 2.
P. 7. l. 6. for 4 r. 3.
P. 9 l. 20. r. *Idolaters.*
P. 13. l. 13. r. *Greeks and.*
l. 20 and 23. r. *Jephilleh.*
l. 29. r. *Rabbin.*
P. 25. l. 28. after *one* put, after *Letter* dele,
P. 26. l. 30. r. *Scripto.*
P. 27. l. 33. dele 1.
P. 29. l. 3. r. *Salmur.*
l. 23. r. *4th,*
P. 30. l. 9. r. *Summ.*
l. 12. for 2 r. 3.
P. 31. l. 2. place 1.
P. 34 l. 3. r. *vein.*
l. 11. r. *and the first.*
P. 36. l. 4. r. *and the Contents.*

FINIS.